



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

revised the piece, rather than against his original authorship of it." This looks to me like a Parthian attempt to outflank one of the pieces of positive evidence from "the early editions or notices in Henslowe and the *Stationers' Register*," which must be squarely faced and debated, I think, before one is privileged to venture a hypothesis about the play's origin. I do not understand Mr. Gray when he seems to suggest in his reply that this evidence can only be put to the use that Fuller makes of it, and that refutation of Fuller exonerates a critic from the duty of attempting a constructive interpretation of his own.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

POSTSCRIPT

I appreciate the more courteous tone of Mr. Brooke's reply. I do not in the least accuse him of any personal or unworthy motives in his attack upon me. On his letter above I offer the following brief notes.

(1) The point is simply that Jonson was not an untried nor even an obscure writer when he was employed to produce additions to the *Spanish Tragedy*. (2) There are other methods of considering a question of authorship besides that of reëxamining the familiar data, and the obligation upon one who is approaching the problem from a different angle is simply that he must not run counter to those data. (3) A play which Shakespeare *revised* would presumably be acted by the company with which he was associated; whereas a play which he had originally written, if taken over by another company, would naturally be revised by the authors who worked for that company. Perhaps my note did not state this with sufficient clearness. To Mr. Brooke's concluding sentence I answer that I did not say "can only be put" but "have been put to."

H. D. GRAY.

Stanford University.

Piers Plowman IN ART

In a recent article¹ entitled "*Piers Plowman* in English Wall-Paintings," Mr. E. W. Tristram advances the theory that certain representations of the crucified Christ preserved on the walls of English country churches have been inspired by the teachings set forth in *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. In these wall-paintings, badly mutilated in most cases, the figure is "surrounded by many tools of labour, arranged so as to form a halo or glory." "Clearly," he continues, "the painter has wished to convey the idea of the

¹ Printed in *The Burlington Magazine*, XXXI (October, 1917), 135 ff.

analogy of Christ's suffering and crucifixion to the life of the labourer," and this idea, the writer asserts, was suggested by *Piers Plowman*.² He notes in support of his theory that in the poem Christ appears in the person of Piers Plowman, "a labourer working and suffering amongst his fellows," and that the poem preaches salvation through labour. As existing manuscripts of the poem are of a poor type, written evidently for the humble reader, so the paintings in question are "paintings of the poor and not of the rich" both in theme and in execution. They are witnesses, the writer suggests, in favor of the supposition that the ideas set forth in *Piers Plowman* had the sympathy of the poorer clergy.

One may grant individual points in the writer's theory, but to the theory as a whole there are damaging objections. It is true that *Piers Plowman* preaches salvation by labor and in its opening sections exalts the figure of Piers, the common laborer in the fields. It is true, also, that Piers and Christ are identified in the later part of the poem. The writer quotes in support of this point the passage telling of the jousting of Jesus in the arms of Piers.³ But in this part of the poem Piers no longer represents the simple laborer. He is, rather, all mankind; his arms which Christ puts on are *humana natura*. The figure involved in this representation of the crucifixion is not that of Christ, or Piers, the laboring man, surrounded by the tools of his daily toil, but Christ the knight, arrayed in *helm* and *haberion*, riding to meet the challenge of Satan in knightly tournament. However much emphasis the poem puts on labor as the means of salvation, there is no such identification of Christ and the laborer, no such connection between the toil of the laborer and the sufferings of Christ on the cross as the theory under discussion seems to demand. The suggestion for a crucified Christ surrounded by a halo of laborer's tools is not to be found in the text itself of *Piers Plowman*, and one may question if evidence for such a treatment of the subject could be read into the text.

How then is one to explain this peculiar halo? The most satisfactory answer is this: that these objects are not tools of labor, but the well-known instruments of the passion. The delapidated condition of the paintings makes perfect identification of all the objects impossible, but several are distinct enough to leave little doubt as to their true nature. In the wall-painting at Ampney S. Mary Church, Gloucestershire, Mr. Tristram finds the following objects:⁴ mallet, wheel, hammer, knife, comb, dish, axe, horn, saddle, ball of cord, pincers. Not all of these objects belong with the instruments of the passion. Perhaps in some cases the identification is to be

² The paintings "are all later than the first version of the poem, and are clearly directly inspired by it" (p. 136).

³ P. 135. The passage is quoted from Passus XXI, 20 f., C version. In P. XXII, 6 f., C version, is another passage where Piers, "peynted al bloody," and with a cross, is described as "like in alle lymes to oure lord Iesu," (Skeat, *Piers the Plowman*, Oxford, 1886, I, p. 551).

⁴ P. 136. A photograph and drawing of the painting are given.

questioned. But several of them, such as the mallet, hammer, knife, dish, and pincers, clearly belong in that list. In another painting, that at Stedham, Sussex, one can recognize the vessel containing vinegar, several rod-like objects which are, probably, the reeds and staves, a knife, and, possibly, a scourge.⁵ The correctness of this interpretation of the objects in question is confirmed by comparing these wall-paintings with the illustrations accompanying a series of prayers on the symbols of the passion in two fifteenth century mss., reproduced in *Legends of the Holy Rood*.⁶ Here the text leaves no doubt as to the object illustrated in the drawing. One notes a certain similarity between some of these illustrations and some of the objects distinguishable in the wall-paintings; for instance, in the case of the vessel of vinegar and the scourge in the Stedham painting.

One need scarcely argue that the instruments of the passion would find a fitting and natural place in representations of the crucifixion. They symbolized each incident in the suffering, and in themselves they summed up the whole story of the passion, as the prayers just mentioned show. Their significance would be at once apparent to the congregation, so much so, one would think, that the attempt to introduce these familiar objects with a new interpretation, as symbols of Christ the laborer, must have been lost upon those acquainted with the accepted symbolism. Some more strikingly different symbolism would have to be employed. It is more reasonable to interpret the paintings in question as orthodox representations of the crucifixion, showing Christ surrounded by the instruments of His passion. With this simpler and more plausible explanation at hand, one must put aside the perhaps more attractive theory that the decorator of these country churches was illustrating in his crude way Piers Plowman's doctrine of the divinity of labor.

CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN.

Mount Holyoke College.

LONGAEVUS ERROR TYPOGRAPHICUS

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* for June, 1918, Professor W. P. Mustard gives some very interesting sources and parallels for many phrases in Lyly's *Euphues*.

On page 336 of the *Notes*, apropos "The old verse, 'That Galen giveth goods, Justinian honours,'" Professor Mustard cites a stanza in the *Anatomy of Melancholy* (I, 2. 3. 15) and says: "Burton quotes it from 'Buchanan. eleg. lib.,' but his reference seems to be wrong." Wrong Burton undoubtedly is, if he must be held respon-

⁵ At one side of the figure is a pair of scales, not, as far as I know, usually included with the instruments of the passion.

⁶ *E. E. T. S.*, 46, p. 170 f.